

## REMARKS

### A. Background

Claims 1-21 were pending in the application at the time of the Office Action. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-14, 16, 20 and 21 were rejected to as being anticipated by cited art. Claims 3, 6, 15 and 17-19 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. By this response applicant has canceled claims 3, 6-11, 14, 15 and 17-21 and amended claims 1, 4, 12 and 16. As such, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 12, 13 and 16 are presented for the Examiner's consideration in light of the following remarks.

### B. Proposed Amendments

By this response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, and 16 to respectively incorporate the limitations of claims 3, 6, and 17, which previously depended from claims 1, 4, and 16. Applicant has also amended claim 12 to incorporate the limitations of claims 14 and 15, which previously depended from claim 12. Support for these amendments may be found in the prior pending claim language. In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the claims do not introduce new matter and entry thereof is respectfully requested.

### C. Rejection on the Merits

Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action reject claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-14, 16, 20 and 21 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,072,592 to Sarraf ("*Sarraf*"). Applicant submits that in view of amendments made herein, the rejected claims are in allowable condition, as detailed below.

D. Allowable Subject Matter

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action objected to claims 3, 6, 15 and 17-19 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but stated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As noted above, Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, and 16 to respectively incorporate the limitations of claims 3, 6, and 17. Applicant has also amended claim 12 to incorporate the limitations of claims 14 and 15. As such, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 4, 12 and 16 are allowable for at least the reasons that claims 3, 6, 15, and 17 were considered allowable in the Office Action. Claims 2, 5 and 13 depend from claims 1, 4 and 12, respectively and thus incorporate the limitations thereof. As such, Applicant submits that claims 2, 5 and 13 are also in allowable condition.

In connection with the foregoing, Applicant respectfully notes that an objection, by definition, concerns only the form of the claim(s) (as distinguished from the substance of the claim) with respect to which the objection has been posed. *See* MPEP §§ 706.01, 608.01(n) (emphasis added). Thus, simply rewriting a dependent claim in the manner suggested by the Examiner constitutes only a change to the format of the claim and, without more, has no effect with regard to the substance of the rewritten claim.

Because Applicant has made no change to claims 1, 4, 12 and 16 (corresponding to old claims 3, 6, 15, and 17) other than to rewrite such claims in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, Applicant respectfully submits that no change has been made herein to the substance of such claims and, further, that such claims, as rewritten herein, are now in condition for allowance.

No other objections or rejections were set forth in the Office Action.

D. Conclusion

Applicant notes that this response does not discuss every reason why the claims of the present application are distinguished over the cited art. Most notably, applicant submits that many if not all of the dependent claims are independently distinguishable over the cited art. Applicant has merely submitted those arguments which it considers sufficient to clearly distinguish the claims over the cited art.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 12, 13 and 16 as amended and presented herein.

In the event there remains any impediment to allowance of the claims which could be clarified in a telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to initiate such an interview with the undersigned.

Dated this 28th day of February 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/SCOTT A. WOODBURY/ Reg. #55,743  
SCOTT A. WOODBURY

Registration 55,743  
DANA L. TANGREN  
Registration No. 37,246  
Attorneys for Applicant  
Customer No. 022913  
Telephone No. 801.533.9800

SAW:cad  
W:\14321\80\SW0000000210V001.DOC